

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

3 ***

4
5 J. MICHAEL SCHAEFER,
6 Plaintiff,

7 vs.

8 STEPHEN HUNDLEY,
9 Defendant.
10

2:15-cv-02017-RFB-VCF
ORDER

11 Before the court is Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion to Strike 10/16/17 Tardy Answer to FAC (ECF No.
12 50). Since this motion is filed as ex-parte, Defendant received no notification of the filing of instant
13 motion through CM/ECF. Schaefer has not provided the court with any reason to grant the relief on an *ex*
14 *parte* basis.

15 Pursuant to Local Rule IA 7-2(b), neither party nor an attorney for any party may make an *ex parte*
16 communication with the court except as specifically permitted by the local rules or the Federal Rules of
17 Civil Procedure. Here, Schaefer has not given good cause or any compelling reason why the instant
18 motion was submitted to the Court without notice to defendant.

19 Accordingly,

20 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that any opposition to Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion to Strike 10/16/17
21 Tardy Answer to FAC (ECF No. 50) must be filed on or before November 28, 2017. The reply in support
22 of Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion to Strike 10/16/17 Tardy Answer to FAC (ECF No. 50) is due December 5,
23 2017.
24
25

1 The Clerk of Court is directed to remove the ex parte status on Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion to Strike
2 10/16/17 Tardy Answer to FAC (ECF No. 50).

3 DATED this 14th day of November, 2017.

4
5 

6 _____
7 CAM FERENBACH
8 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25